

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed October 30, 2007. Claims 1-25, 30, 31, and 35-37 were rejected. In this response, claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 13, 16, 19, 21, 25, 31, and 35-37 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-25, 30, 31 and 35-37 are pending. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 7, 13, 31, and 37 because of typographical errors that are not part of the amendments to the claims. Applicants have accordingly amended the claims to remove the typographical errors noted by the Examiner. In light of the amendments, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejects claims 4, 9, 16, 31, 35, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 4 and 16 to recite “at least one unconsciously captured electronic document,” instead of “the unconsciously captured electronic documents.” Furthermore, Applicants have amended claims 16, 31, 35, and 36 to recite “private local network search” instead of “local network search.” In light of these amendments, Applicants submit that the limitations claimed within claims 4, 9, 16, 31, 35, and 36 have a sufficient antecedent basis. Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 4, 9, 16, 31, 35, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-19, 21-22, 24-25, 30-31 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Singhal (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,527) in view of Walker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,681). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Singhal describes a meta-search engine device for searching distributed network environments (Singhal, Abstract; Column 2, lines 18-34). The meta-search engine sends search requests to a plurality of search engines and compiles the results (Singhal, Column 2, lines 35-58). The search is performed on storage devices connected to a network, or a combination of networks, where the storage devices “store information and files that may be of interest to a user” (Singhal, Column 3, lines 30-40; Column 4, lines 45-57). The search engine devices return results, which are correlated with each other, ranked, and displayed to a user (Singhal, Column 6, lines 1-28).

Walker describes a method of saving a document in a background thread while editing of the document occurs in a foreground thread (Walker, Abstract; Column 1, 40-47). As discussed by Walker, in a word processing program, documents may either be saved manually by user, or as part of an auto-save feature of the word processor program. The auto-save feature saves an open document periodically by incrementally saving changes to the document (Walker, Column 1, lines 40-47).

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

A method comprising:
generating, automatically with an electronic device without user intervention, a private local network search request in response to an original search request, the private local network search request to cause a search to be performed on electronic documents stored by a device that is part of a private locate network, the private local network search request making the documents searchable by electronic devices belonging to an organization corresponding to

the electronic device and not searchable by remote electronic devices not corresponding to the organization, and wherein one or more of the documents are archived on the device of the private local network in the absence of an explicit command by a user to save the electronic documents, but archived and indexed in response to another user specified function associated with the electronic documents to transmit the electronic documents over the private local network or process the electronic documents by one or more devices connected to the private local network, the search of the electronic documents on the private local network to be performed according to search parameters of the original search request and without making available the electronic documents to search requests of remote electronic devices outside the private local network;

(Emphasis Added)

That is Claim 1 recites generating a private local network search request, as part of an original search request. The private local network search request causes a search to be performed on electronic documents stored by a device of the private local network. One or more of the electronic documents are archived on the device within an explicit command of a user to save the electronic documents. Rather, the electronic documents stored on the device of the private local network are archived and indexed in response to another user function, such as transmitting the document over the private local network or processing the document by one or more devices connected to the private local network. Applicants respectfully submit that Singhal and Walker fail to describe or suggest each and every limitation as claimed.

Singhal describes that a user directly causes a controller to save search results based on an explicit command (Singhal, column 6, lines 38-40). When a user initiates a search request for the controller, the controller saves the search results in response to fulfilling the request. Thus, the controller described by Singhal is capturing exactly that which was requested by a user, search results. Furthermore, the Examiner notes that Singhal fails to describe documents are saved in the absence of explicit user commands (*See* Office Action, mailed October 30, 2007, page 5), and thus must fail to describe generating a search request of documents on a local

private network “wherein one or more of the documents are archived on the device of the private local network in the absence of an explicit command by a user to save the electronic documents, but archived and indexed in response to another user specified function associated with the electronic documents to transmit the electronic documents over the private local network or process the electronic documents by one or more devices connected to the private local network.” search of those documents.

Walker is utilized by the Examiner to describe an autosave utility running in the background of a document, to show that documents may be saved in the absence of explicit user commands (Office Action, mailed October 30, 2007, page 5). As discussed by Walker, when a computer is running a word processing program, the word processing program may automatically save updated versions of the document as a user works on the document (Walker, column 1, lines 40-47). Applicants’ claims, however, are directed to integrating search results for documents that are archived and indexed on a device of a local private network, when a user transmits or otherwise processes the document on a network device, on the local private network.

Although the word processing program of Walker saves a current document without requiring a manual save command, Walker is silent as to the archiving and indexing of documents to storage devices on a network. That is, Walker describes a user application that saves copies of a document while a user works on the document in a word processing program. The autosaved version may then be recalled even though a user did not manually direct the word processing program to save the document. The autosaved document and the word processing program, however, are not described as archiving any documents to a device of a local private network without an explicit command of a user. Furthermore, Walker fails to describe or even suggest that an autosaved document is indexed to a local storage device so that it can be searched

at a later time. The idea of document search, of archived an indexed documents, is completely absent from Walker. Rather, Walker merely saves a document locally so that it can later be recalled by the word processing program.

Therefore, Walker also fails to describe or suggest the concept of generating a private local network search of electronic documents “wherein one or more of the documents are archived on the device of the private local network in the absence of an explicit command by a user to save the electronic documents, but archived and indexed in response to another user specified function associated with the electronic documents to transmit the electronic documents over the private local network or process the electronic documents by one or more devices connected to the private local network.”

Thus, Singhal and Walker, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest each and every feature as claimed in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Singhal and Walker fail to render claim 1 obvious for at least the reasons discussed above. Independent claims 13 and 25 include similar limitations and features to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and thus are also not rendered obvious by Singhal in view of Walker for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12 depend from claim 1. Claims 14-19, 21, 22 and 24 depend from claim 13. Claims 30, 31 and 35-37 depend from claim 25. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-19, 21, 22, 24, 30, 31 and 35-37 are not rendered obvious by Singhal in view of Walker for at least the reasons set forth above.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-19, 21-22, 24-25, 30-31 and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Singhal in view of Walker.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal and Walker as applied to claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, above, and further in view of Nasr, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,332). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1, and claim 20 depends from claim 13. Nasr is cited to teach a search report as either HTML or XML (Final Office Action, page 9, mailed July 18, 2006). However, whether or not Nasr discloses HTML and/or XML search results, Nasr does not cure the deficiencies of Singhal and Walker set forth above. Therefore, no combination of Singhal, Walker, and Nasr teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 8 and 20.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal, in view of Walker, and further in view of Nasr.

The Examiner rejects claims 11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal and Walker as applied to claims 1, 7, 13 and 19, above, and further in view of Rakavy, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,040). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and claim 23 depends from claim 13. Rakavy is cited to teach a search report having an advertisement selected based on the search results (Final Office Action, page 8, mailed July 18, 2006). However, whether or not Rakavy discloses the selection of advertisements, Rakavy does not cure the deficiencies of Singhal and Walker set forth above.

Therefore, Singhal, Walker, and Rakavy, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 11 and 23.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal, in view of Walker, and further in view of Rakavy.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: January 30, 2008

/Michael J. Mallie/
Michael J. Mallie
Attorney for Applicant
(Reg. No. 36,591)

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300